NUMBER PRD-06

#### PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

For Calendar Year: 2004

New	$\boxtimes$
Previous Year (below line/defer)	

**Issue:** Consider scheduling separate times for BMX Bike use of Fair Oaks

Skateboard Park

**Lead Department:** Parks and Recreation

**General Plan Element or Sub-Element:** 

#### 1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?

The Fair Oaks Skateboard Park, opened in the spring of 2003, has generated interest from youths desiring to ride their BMX bikes in the skateboard "bowl". This desire was raised by some of the youths during the Skate Park Forum held in August 2003 to solicit feedback from the users of the site. Current rules and regulations prohibit the use of BMX (or any type of bicycle) in the Skate Park for a variety of reasons primary among them is the safety of the other participants on skates or skateboards. Suggestions were made by the youths to schedule separate times for BMX bike use of the site so bike users would not interfere with skateboarders. This study would investigate the pro and cons of allowing BMX bikes into the Skate Park and the alternatives available to accommodate them.

## 2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy? Recreation Sub- Element:

GOAL D: PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGH QUALITY LEISURE INVOLVEMENT WHICH PROMOTES THE PHYSICAL AND MENTAL WELL BEING OF THE COMMUNITY AND ENSURES EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTICIPATION.

POLICY D.1: Provide a balanced range of program choices to meet the diverse needs of the community.

D.1.i. Develop and implement programs which provide constructive opportunities for fitness and well-being; healthy coping and stress management; creative expression, education, and skill development; and personal enrichment. POLICY D.3. Provide recreation programs which meet the complex needs of youth.

GOAL E: PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN RECREATION FACILITIES BASED ON COMMUNITY NEED, AS WELL AS ON THE ABILITY OF THE CITY TO FINANCE, CONSTRUCT, MAINTAIN, AND OPERATE THESE FACILITIES NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.

POLICY E.1. Provide, maintain, and operate recreation facilities such as

PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE – CONT.

PAGE 2 OF 4

CONSIDER SCHEDULING SEPARATE TIMES FOR BMX BIKE USE OF FAIR OAKS SKATEBOARD

PARK

Origin of issue:

3.

swimming pools, tennis courts, golf courses, athletic fields, trails, parks, arts facilities, community centers, park centers, and other specialized facilities in a safe, high quality, usable condition that will serve and meet the recreational needs of the community.

	Councilmember:		
	General Plan:		
	Staff:		
	BOARD or COMMISSION		
	Arts	Housing & Human Svcs	
	Bldg. Code of Appeals	Library	
	BPAC	Parks & Rec.	X
	CCAB	Personnel	
	Heritage & Preservation	Planning	
		mmission ranked Defer* of	
	Board / Commission Ranking/		
	*The Parks and Recreation Cor study until after calendar year 20	ommission recommended deferral of this 004.	issue for
4.	Multiple Year Project? Yes	No X Expected Year of Completio	n
5.	Estimated work hours for com	npletion of the study issue.	
	(a) Estimated work hours from	n the lead department	8
	(b) Estimated work hours from	n consultant(s):	2
	(c) Estimated work hours from	n the City Attorney's Office:	2
	(d) List any other department(s hours:	(s) and number of work	
	Department(s):		
	Total Estimated Hours:		12
6.	Expected participation involve	ed in the study issue process?	
	(a) Does Council need to appro	rove a work plan? Yes	No X

(b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission?	l	Yes X	No
If so, which Board/Commission?	Parks and Recreation		
/	4 10		

(c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated?

Yes No X

(d) What is the public participation process?

Staff would hold public hearings with the Parks and Recreation Commission (inviting BMX bikers and skateboarders to attend)

### 7. Estimated Fiscal Impact:

Cost of Study	<b>\$ 0</b>
Capital Budget Costs	\$ unknown, but significant in terms of eventual renovation of skatepark
New Annual Operating Costs	\$ unknown, but could be significant in terms of continued repairs to skatepark
New Revenues or Savings	<b>\$ 0</b>
10 Year RAP Total	\$
<b>Budget Modification Needed</b>	\$

#### 8. Staff Recommendation

**Recommended for Study** 

X Against Study

No Recommendation

Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

Staff recommends against this study as currently worded (specifically explores allowing BMX bikes into the existing skatepark). Staff has already studied this issue at length, given the expressed interest of BMX bikers in entering the skatepark. As indicated by the City's skatepark designer: "Bicyclists are typically considered a threat to other

# PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE – CONT. PAGE 4 OF 4 CONSIDER SCHEDULING SEPARATE TIMES FOR BMX BIKE USE OF FAIR OAKS SKATEBOARD PARK

(inline/skateboard) skatepark users. For this reason, most public agencies do not allow mixed use.....Grinding, gouging, and chipping of the steel coping and concrete surfaces are the most typical forms of damage caused by bicycle use. The damage is problematic because it creates dangerous conditions for skaters and is very difficult and expensive to repair. If the damage were to be repaired on an annual basis, unsafe conditions would still exist most of the year or the interval between repairs. Patching chipped concrete is a somewhat futile endeavor. Once a patch, always a weak point, subject to further chipping and repairs."

While the terrain of the skatepark would serve the needs of bicyclists as well as skaters, bikes would compromise the structural integrity of the skate park. Allowing use of the existing skatepark for bikers will result in damage which can not be effectively or efficiently repaired, and which will present on-going hazardous conditions to skaters. The skatepark was designed for skaters only. If Sunnyvale wants a facility for bikers, a better course of action would be to explore other options (e.g. a separate facility) for that purpose. Staff would support such a study given the time and resources, but can not support this study given its narrow focus.

reviewed by		
Department Director	Date	
approved by		
City Manager	Date	